DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 410 SP 025 368

AUTHOR Scarbrough, William; And Others
TITLE Expanding Frontiers: Analyzing the Implementation of Public Schools Professional Development Programs.
PUB DATE 9 Feb 84
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (West Palm Beach, FL, February 9, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of a staff development program entitled "Skills for Effective Teaching," which was adapted in a Virginia public school district, was to teach effective instructional skills to teachers who did not possess or demonstrate those skills. The program was also aimed at retaining and reinforcing the effective instructional skills exhibited by the staff and improving the quality of existing staff development practices. Two groups of teachers (program and non-program) were observed to determine their demonstrated instructional skills. The program group received one-day training sessions specific to each of the five program objectives during the academic semester. At the end of this period, all teachers (program and non-program) were again observed to determine their demonstrated instructional skills. "Program" teachers were also surveyed as to their perceptions regarding the worth of the staff development program. The five basic instructional skills emphasized in the program are outlined and described. A discussion is presented on the research methodology used to analyze the findings. Results indicate that the Skills for Effective Teaching professional development program holds promise as a viable teacher performance development program. The research instrument used is appended as well as data obtained from the study. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251410

Expanding Frontiers: Analyzing the Implementation of Public Schools Professional Development Programs

William Scarbrough - Univ. of Virginia - School of Education

Risa Gressard - Univ. of Virginia - School of Education

Jane McCullen, Ed.D., Hopewell Public Schools

SP 025 368

A paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Annual Meeting West Palm Beach, Florida - February 9, 1984.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. H. Scarbrough III

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

There appears to be little argument that schools, in particular those in the public domain, are in serious difficulty today. This difficulty has manifested itself as a concern for (1) quality education, (2) debate regarding what schools can and cannot do, (3) confusion as to what schooling students should be exposed to, (4) the lack of agreement upon and preponderance with the most appropriate delivery system of instruction, (5) sharp disagreements pertaining to governance and decision-making structures and (6) the overall ability of schools to significantly impact the quality of our citizenry in a less than static society (Griffin, 1983). What the public is looking for today are programs to believe in. With standardized test scores falling, federal monies drying up or being redirected, declining college enrollments and college graduates going on to higher paying industrial or commercial jobs, public (and private) schools are struggling to secure qualified teachers and win the public's trust by creating programs and services aimed at improving the quality of schooling.

One particular area which has received a significant proportion of attention recently is that of teacher professional development. Although some would argue that teacher professional development is merely another panacea created by concerned individuals aimed at ameliorating problems (which impede the progress of schools or students) it does, however, target some of the most significant problems faced by schools today: and holds promise as a potentially effective solution.

During the 1978-1979 school year, a professional development program entitled "Skills for Effective Teaching" (SET) was

adapted in a public school division in Virginia. Actual implementation of the program began in June, 1979. The program was designed to improve the instructional skills of teachers, supervisors and administrators with the presumption that student achievement would be positively affected. The primary purpose of the program was to meet the recognized need to teach effective instructional skills to teachers who were identified as not possessing or demonstrating those skills. Additionally, the program was aimed at reinforcing the effective instructional skills exhibited by staff, improving the quality of existing professional development practices and meeting the public demand for accountability through staff performance.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether this program was effectively implemented and to investigate other program effects related to public school teacher classroom performance. Answers to the following evaluation questions were sought:

(1) Does the SET program teach the knowledges, skills and attitudes which it purports to teach?

(2) Do teachers with SET training successfully demonstrate the "skills for effective teaching"?

(3) Is there a significantly greater proportion of SET group teachers who change in demonstrating each skill of the program than the non SET group over time?

(4) Do SET teachers believe that the skills training is valuable to them professionally and/or personally?

(5) What other effects found may be attributed to the program?

The evaluation was performed with two assumptions in mind:

(1) Principals, supervisors and/or administrators supported the program and

(2) The skills taught are related to the positive achievement of students.

No formal efforts had been made by the School Board Office to investigate instructional effectiveness to this time (defined as teacher performance significantly related to student achievement). These assumptions are to be investigated in a later stage of this program's development.

The following is a brief description of the content presented to teachers in the staff development program entitled "Skills for Effective Teaching."

Educators who complete the program successfully demonstrate while teaching, the ability to apply basic learned instructional skills. These skills are:

1. Teach to a specific learning objective
2. Select an objective at the appropriate level of difficulty
3. Monitor progress and select alternatives while teaching
4. Maintain the focus of the learner
5. Use, but not abuse, the principles of learning such as anticipatory set, closure, covert and overt behavior, motivation, reinforcement, retention, and transfer.

The first basic instructional skill is Teaching to a Specific Objective.

> Emphasis is not on being able to write objectives but rather to be able to teach an objective after one has been selected. The teacher is expected to generate relevant overt behavior in the learner. During the lesson the teacher gives explanation, asks questions, provides activities, and offers responses to the

efforts of the learner. All of these components must be present in a lesson and should be relevant to the objective. A teacher, however, is not tied inflexibly to the objective. The teacher has the option to leave the objective, however, an awareness that the objective has been abandoned must be exhibited.

The second instructional skill is Teaching at the Correct Level of Difficulty.

This was determined by use of a task analysis, which was a listing of enabling sub-learnings essential to the terminal objective.By diagnostically analyzing each learner, the teacher had the mechanism by which to select objectives which are at the correct level of difficulty for each learner.

The third instructional skill is Monitoring the Progress of the Learner and Adjusting the Lesson by Selecting Alternative Techniques, Activities, or Objectives, if necessary.

The teacher should constantly be aware of the learners and where they stand relative to accomplishing the objective. The task analysis is a gross diagnosis. Monitoring and adjusting is the refined diagnosis. A study of Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) is included in the professional development program to give the teacher additional alternatives for adjustment. The teacher can increase or decrease the level of difficulty or level of complexity of the lesson.

The fourth instructional skill is maintaining the focus of the Learner.

The teacher must be aware of students on and off-task, strategies for involvement and initiating and closing lessons. The focus is to keep the learner involved in meaningful activity.

The final instructional skill is Using, without Abusing, the Principles of Learning.

> A principle of learning is any variable in the classroom whether it is intended to be there or not. It is the total environment in which the learning occurs. Most variables in a classroom cannot be controlled by the teacher. The professional development program only deals with eight principles of learning that can be controlled by the teacher. These are set, closure, covert behavior, overt behavior, motivation, reinforcement, retention, and transfer.

Madeline Hunter views teaching as a decision-making process. She has attempted to illuminate for teachers and administrators the scientific principles of learning. The incorporation of these principles, she believes, enables the art of teaching to emerge. She concedes that the complex nature of human psychological and environmental variables make the social sciences less exacting than the physical sciences. However, there is evidence that certain behaviors in teachers increase the probability of generating desirable learning and minimizing undesirable learning in students.

Hunter indicates that there are four essential steps when implementing a program to improve instructional skills. The first is to develop a cadre of teachers, building supervisors, administrators and/or professors who become sophisticated in the analysis of teaching. These persons must be able to: (a) comprehend the "how" of teaching, (b) identify principles of learning in teaching situations, (c) create and analyze behavior records, (d) evaluate a lesson, and (e) conduct a teacher conference. The second step is to develop the instructional skills in teachers through professional development programs. In

the third step, supervisors, administrators or professors observe the teacher's ability to translate the instructional skills into the teacher's own classroom situation (the observation also adds incentive for the teacher to practice and transfer the skills into the classroom). In the fourth step, supervisors, administrators, or professors conduct a conference with the teacher, commending the teacher for strengths and remediating and reteaching areas of observed weakness. A teacher-preparation institution, an individual school or an entire division wishing to increase the effectiveness of instruction needs to accomplish all four basic steps.

In order to determine the success of professional development practices, the literature supports the position that both teacher behavior (that which is demonstated in the classroom) and teacher attitudes be sought. Few studies have been devised for evaluating the overall impact of professional development programs. Most generally respond by assessing their "perceived worth." The growing research on, and analysis of teaching (and its direct relevance to determining healthy teaching practices) has led research and evaluation of professional development programs to the aforementioned more "holistic" perspective involving performance and attitudes.

The perspective forwarded in this study is one of triangulation; triangulation or multiplicity of (1) perspectives (quantitative and qualitative),(2) methods (e.g., observation and surveying), and (3) analysis strategies (quantitative and qualitative). In order to give an accurate description and subsequently useful evaluation of program implementation, a

comprehensive, exhaustive and meaningful investigation of all relevant program components must be made.

The focus of research on professional development programs parallels that of research on teaching; what the teacher does in the classroom. Prior to making any judgement (expert or otherwise) as to how well a teacher performs, the teacher's repertoire of skills must first be judged adequately complete. A good teacher consistently performs a complete set of effective instructional skills.

Another focus of research on professional development following from systems analysis is the stage at which the program is analyzed. In the first stage, professional development programs are assessed relative to input issues answering the question "is the program and all of its resources delivered to the specified group"? The next stage of analysis includes investigating the success or failure of that program's implementation; most often operationally defined as teacher demonstration of program specific instructional skills. In the final stage, the program's "effects" and impact on students (ultimately) is investigated (getting at the teacher effectiveness notion). Each of these stages are qualitatively different and require complimentary, yet somewhat different approaches to address them. Additionally, there is an implied hierarchy to these stages which demand that the research at a particular stage necessarily be sensitive to the previous stage concerns and analyses.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects. A total of 47 teachers from a medium-sized school division in Virginia participated in this study. Of this total 30 were elementary teachers, 10 were middle school teachers, and 7 were high school teachers; teaching experience of the teachers ranged from 1 to 40 years.

Instruments. Each participant in the study was observed by a trained observer using the**Teacher Observation Instrument** (see Figure 1). This instrument provides a means for rating of a teacher's ability to demonstrate each of the five major SET skills. The instrument is designed in the form of a checklist with each of the five major SET skills listed. Below each of the major skills is listed the minor SET skills, which collectively define the major skills. In some cases, subskills are listed below the minor skills. An "other/comments" item is also included under each major skill section. As teachers are observed in the classroom, a trained observer places a check mark by those minor skills and subskills which are clearly demonstrated. Other/Observations comments are also recorded when appropriate.

Five "scores" are computed for each teacher. If a teacher received a checkmark for all minor skills listed below a major skill, a "pass" (P) was recorded for that major skill. If all minor skills are not checked, a "fail" (F) was recorded. The only exception to this recording procedure was for the major skill, Monitoring and Adjustment. For this skill, it was not necessary for a teacher to have been observed demonstrating "adjusting, if necessary" in order to receive a passing score for

that skill. Any comments written on the instrument were used as references (notes) for observers and are not used in the scoring of the instrument.

Each teacher who participated in the SET inservice program was administered the **Skills for Effective Teaching (SET) Evaluation Instrument** and the **Attitudes of Teachers Instrument.**

The **SET Evaluation Instrument** (see Figure 2) provides an opportunity for teachers to evaluate their "understanding" and their "ability to do" (perform) specified major and minor SET skills. Teachers respond to how well they understand the skill by selecting one of three responses ranging from "to a great extent" to "to a limited extent". Teachers also respond to their ability to perform the same skills by selecting from the same responses. Information is also obtained (in an open-ended format) as to the teachers' evaluation of teacher benefits, student benefits, overall value and helpfulness, etc. of instructors and observers employed in the SET program. Additional comments were also solicited.

The **Attitudes of Teachers Instrument** (see Figure 3) provided teachers with an opportunity to indicate their perceived ability to demonstrate the five major SET skills before and after the SET program. Teachers indicate which of the minor skills they thought they demonstrated before the program began, and then after the program was completed. Five "scores" were computed for each teacher, one "score" for each major skill, using the same procedure as was used for the **Teacher Observation Instrument.**

Information was also obtained relative to teachers'

attitudes toward the SET program (its effect on job attitude, personal workability and willingness to recommend SET as a Professional Development program for other school systems).

Procedures. A randomized pretest-posttest control group design was applied this study. Teachers were stratified by teaching level (Elementary, Middle and Secondary) and then randomly assigned to either the (experimental) SET group (n=24) or the (control) non SET group (n=23). During January 1983 teachers in both groups were a pre-observed by members of the school division administrative staff trained in SET using standardized observation procedures. After all pre-observations were completed, the treatment (SET program), was administered to the SET group.

The SET Program Training led by a professional instructor, consisted of 5 sessions, one for each major SET instructional skill. Each of the first 4 sessions was followed by a teacher observation in which teachers were given feedback as to their performance of the SET instructional skills that had been taught in the training up to that time (Note: due to a scheduling conflict brought on by snow days, five SET group teachers did not receive an observation after the second SET inservice session.)

No treatment was administerd to the non SET group. Within the four weeks following the last training session, teachers in both groups received a post-observation.

The **SET Evaluation Instrument** was distributed to the SET group teachers at the final session of the SET training. Approximately six weeks after the training and one to four weeks after teachers had received a post-observation, the **Attitudes of**

Teachers Instrument was mailed to the SET group teachers. Completion of both instruments was optional. Data for all instruments were collected during the Spring of 1983.

Analysis and Results. The observation data of both groups were analyzed by comparing the change in the proportion of teachers demonstrating the five major program skills across time.

Due to the dichotomous, qualitative nature of the preobservation postobservation "scores", a gain score could not be computed by taking the difference between the two scores. Instead, each teacher was assigned a "difference score" which reflected his/her score from both pre and post observation. The range of scores included (1) P/F for a teacher who "passed" the pre observation but who "failed" the post observation; (2) F/F for a teacher who "failed" at both the pre and post observations; (3) P/P for a teacher who "passed" both pre and post observations; and (4) F/P for a teacher who "failed" the pre observation but who "passed" the post observation. In order to determine whether there was an association between the distributions of the differnce scores and the group to which teachers belonged, a chi square test was performed.

Frequencies and percentages of teachers having each type of difference score for each of the major program skills are presented in Table 1. The chi square statistic resulting from the distribution of the scores with probability levels of $p<.05$ are also presented. The chi square statistics for each of the skills, Teaching to the Objective, Correct Level of Difficulty, Monitoring and Adjustment, Maintain Focus of the Learner, and Use

without Abuse, were found to be statistically significant (X^2=22.02; df=3; p<.05); (X^2=15.51; df=3; p<.05); (X^2=13.56; df=3; p<.05); (X^2=37.66; df=3; p<.05); (X^2=8.16; df=3; p<.05), respectively. An inspection of the frequencies and percentages of the two groups indicates that for all skills, more SET group teachers demonstrated the skills at post observation than did non SET group teachers. The frequencies also indicate that the statistically significant difference in the distributions of the scores between the two groups is largely due to the greater number of SET group teachers than control group teachers that failed to demonstrate the skills at pre-observation but who did demonstrate them at post-observation.

A total of 23 or 85% of the 27 teachers who were administered the **SET Evaluation Instrument** completed and returned it. (Note: three additional subjects participated in the SET program but were not included in the teacher observation analysis due to their non-teaching roles). Frequencies and percentages were calculated for the responses to the rating scale items.

For both parts of each item, "understanding" and "ability to do", the mode or the most frequent response was "to a great extent". Frequencies and percentages for the mode response were slightly lower in the case of "ability to do" than for "understanding", however. Also, four of the minor skills listed, Task Analysis, Bloom's Taxonomy, Retention, and Transfer, did not receive as high a frequency of "to a great extent" responses in either of the rating scales as did the other major and minor skills listed. These results suggest that teachers perceived their ability to perform a skill to be slightly more difficult

than understanding the skill. They also suggest that of the skills listed, Task Analysis, Bloom's Taxonomy, Retention, and Transfer may be the more difficult skills to understand and/or perform.

A content analysis was performed using the open-ended information obtained concerning the teachers' evaluation of the SET inservice program. Reinforcement and structuring of current teaching method, instructional organization and analysis of instruction were the most noted teacher benefits. Improved learning climate was considered to be the major student benefit. A standardized, organized way to teach was the most frequently mentioned overall value of the SET program. The realism of the instructor's presentation and the evaluative feedback and support offered by the observers were the most frequent comments offered relative to the instructors and observers. The major theme of additional comments concerned the personal value and enjoyment teachers received from participating in the program.

A total of 17 or 71% of the teachers who were administered the **Attitudes of Teachers Instrument** completed and returned it. Data from this instrument were matched with the teacher observation data for the same 17 teachers. To assess the equivalence between teacher perceptions and observed demonstration of in the five major program skills, exact probabilities were calculated for the pre program and the post-program data. The frequencies and percentages of teachers perceiving that they demonstrated in the five major program skills and teachers that were observed demonstrating pre-program

skills and the exact probabilities calculated are presented in Table 3. The results indicate that there was little difference between whether the demonstration of of teachers was perceived or observed before the program began.

The frequencies and percentages of teachers perceiving that they demonstrated the five major program skills and teachers that were observed demonstrating those skills and the exact probabilities calculated are presented in Table 4. The results indicate that there was little difference between whether the demonstration of skills was perceived or observed after the program was completed.

The response frequencies. The frequencies of response to the items concerning teacher attitudes toward the SET program experience are presented in Table 5. With regard to the effect of the SET program on job attitude the mode response (76%) of teachers was "positively". With regard to the personal workability of SET, the unanimous response (100%) of teachers was "yes". Finally, when asked whether teachers would recommend SET, the mode response (88%) of teachers was "yes".

Other Relevant Data. In addition to the more formal data collected, there was informal interview (and discussion) data and "comments in passing" collected throughout the study. The reasons the study team collected this data are two: (1) less

formally collected information in this context was abundant and (2) the program staff indicated at the onset of the study that they had observed some consistent changes in teacher performance but more evident were the changes in teacher attitudes and enthusiasm toward teaching.

Eleven or 48% of the 23 SET teachers freely gave comments relative to the program and its apparent effects. The comments were recorded in training sessions, post observation conferences and informal discussions with peers and supervisors. The comments were content analyzed using single opinions, thoughts or attitudes as the coding unit and the positive or negative nature of the coding unit as the categorization scheme. Within the categorization scheme, coding units were further organized according to the issue the comment addressed (program effects, training or conferencing). Of the 17 comments made by the 11 SET teachers, 31 thoughts, opinions and attitudes were categorized. All (100%) of the 31 thoughts, opinions and attitudes recorded were stated in a positive vein. The following is a summary of the comments.

Training Of the 31 thoughts, opinions and attitudes recorded, 18 (or 58%) of them dealt with the training teachers received. The most frequent comments (n=6) addresses the opinion that the training was valuable to teachers and served to make them feel that the school division was interested in their efforts. Other less frequent comments included the training was fun (n=4) should be continued on a more regular basis (n=2) and that it should have been done years ago (n=2).

Observation and Conferencing. Eight comments were recorded relative to the observation and conferencing sessions teachers and observers had (26%). The most frequent recorded thought (n=4) was that the observation and conferencing were conducted professionally; with particular attention paid to being helpful. Other, less frequent, comments included the attitude that teachers knew what the skills were but sometimes had difficulty implementing them (n=2), the conferences were "collegial" (n=1) and the observers' enthusiasm and support made the teacher feel at ease (n=1).

Overall Program Effects Experienced. Of the remaining 5 comments (16%), 3 addressed the opinion of teachers who believed that although they may not always demonstrate all program skills, they know what they are and are better teachers because of it. The other two comments were made by teachers who had witnessed improved learning and achievement in their classes.

DISCUSSION

There was a significant positive change in the SET group's ability to demonstrate all five instructional skills after receiving the professional development program. Additionally, more SET group teachers demonstrated the program skills at the last observation than did the nonSET group of teachers. Upon investigating the SET evaluations completed by SET teachers, the results indicated that teachers participating in the program believed, to a great extent, that they understood and could perform nearly all program skills. Additionally, SET teachers indicated that the program had distinct impacts (benefits) upon classroom teaching and teacher motivation. The Attitudes of

Teachers Instrument data (matched with the observation data) showed teachers often perceived they were demonstrating the program instructional skills and were, in fact, performing them. This result indicates teacher self-awareness and supports the perspective that if teachers believe they possess the skills after the program and actually perform them in the classroom, then the program's effect is pervasive (holistic) and tenable. In addition to this perceptual evidence of program success, judging by the survey and interview data, it is clear that SET teachers believed that the program was responsible for their increased enthusiasm relative to classroom teaching and overall positive attitude.

Collectively, the results indicate that a professional development program designed to improve classroom teacher behavior can be effective. However, one must not be led to believe that quantitative research perspectives, data collection and analysis stategies will provide sufficient evidence of program implementation effectiveness. The quantitative analysis, as well as the qualitative, is rich with information explaining program effects; anticipated and unanticipated.

The Skills for Effective Teaching professional development program holds promise as a viable teacher performance development program. It is anticipated that the development of this and similar other public school professional development programs will be more widely and consistently performed if theoretically and performance-based programs facilitate the recognition of professional development as a tenable alternative to pupil and

school improvement. Finally, these programs will not be taken seriously until the research and evaluation community provide comprehensive and useful analyses relative to program effects. Only with convincing evidence will the public believe in public (and private) school improvement efforts.

TABLES

TABLE 1

DIFFERENCE SCORES

Frequencies of Assigned Post Scores for CONTROL and SET Group Teachers

	CONTROL (n=23)				SET (n=24)				Chi Square
Major SET Skills	P/F	F/F	P/P	F/P	P/F	F/F	P/P	F/P	
Teaching to the Objective	0 0%	16 70%	3 13%	4 17%	0 0%	1 4%	7 29%	16 67%	22.02**
Correct Level of Difficulty	4 17%	9 39%	3 13%	7 30%	0 0%	1 4%	7 29%	16 67%	15.51**
Monitoring and Adjusting	1 4%	11 48%	5 22%	6 26%	0 0%	1 4%	10 42%	13 54%	13.56**
Maintain Focus of the Learner	1 4%	22 96%	0 0%	0 0%	1 4%	2 8%	1 4%	20 83%	37.66**
Use Without Abuse Principles of Learning	0 0%	13 57%	3 13%	7 30%	0 0%	4 17%	5 21%	15 62%	8.16*

*p<.05

**p<.01

TABLE 2

SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING EVALUATION

Frequencies of Response to Rating Scale Items
(n=23)

Items	Understanding (EXTENT)			Ability To Do (EXTENT)		
	Great	Some	Limited	Great	Some	Limited
1. ...correct level of difficulty	22	1	0	19	4	0
	96%	4%	0%	83%	17%	0%
2. ...task analysis...	18	4	1	16	6	1
	78%	17%	4%	70%	26%	4%
3. ...Bloom's Taxonomy...	17	6	0	16	7	0
	74%	26%	0%	70%	30%	0%
4. Matching...with objectives	21	1	1	20	2	1
	91%	4%	4%	87%	9%	4%
5. Teaching to an objective...	23	0	0	22	1	0
	100%	0%	0%	96%	4%	0%
6. Maintaining the focus of the learners	21	2	0	19	4	0
	91%	9%	0%	83%	17%	0%
7. Monitoring...and...adjustments...	21	2	0	20	3	0
	91%	9%	9%	87%	13%	0%
8. ...motivation	22	1	0	21	2	0
	96%	4%	9%	91%	9%	0%
9. ...reinforcement	21	2	0	20	3	0
	91%	9%	9%	87%	13%	0%
10. ...retention	17	6	0	13	10	0
	74%	26%	0%	57%	43%	0%
11. ...transfer	17	6	0	15	8	0
	74%	26%	0%	65%	35%	0%

TABLE 3

PRE PROGRAM/OBSERVATION AND PERCEPTION

Frequencies of Teachers Perceiving or Observed Demonstrating the Five Major SET Skills

Major SET Skills	Perceptions (n=17)	Observations (n=17)	Probability
Teaching to the Objective	9 53%	7 41%	.75
Correct Level of Difficulty	2 12%	6 35%	.22
Monitoring Adjusting	9 53%	6 35%	.51
Maintain Focus of the Learner	5 29%	2 12%	.45
Use Without Abuse Principles of Learning	4 24%	3 18%	1.00

TABLE 4

POST PROGRAM/OBSERVATION AND PERCEPTION

Frequencies of Teachers Perceiving or Observed Demonstrating the Five Major SET Skills

Major SET Skills	Perceptions (n=17)	Observations (n=17)	Probability
Teaching to the Objective	15 88%	16 94%	1.00
Correct Level of Difficulty	13 72%	16 94%	.25
Monitoring Adjusting	17 53%	16 94%	1.00
Maintain Focus of the Learner	16 94%	14 82%	.50
Use Without Abuse Principles of Learning	15 88%	15 88%	1.00

TABLE 5

ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS

Frequencies of Response for Forced Choice Items
(n=17)

Items	Frequencies	
	n	%
5. ...participation...affect job attitude.		
positively	13	76%
no change	2	12%
negatively	1	6%
no answer	1	6%
6. ...works for you?		
yes	17	100%
no	0	0%
7. ...recommend?		
yes	15	88%
no	1	6%
no answer	1	6%

FIGURES

FIGURE 1

TEACHER BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING

__ I. TEACHING TO THE OBJECTIVE

__ A. Explanation

__ 1. Relevant and specific teacher input (teacher talk)

a. Lecture

b. Discussion

c. Presentation

__ 2. Definition

__ 3. Examples

__ 4. Demonstrations

__ 5. Modeling

__ 6. Models

__ 7. Audio visuals

__ B. Questions

__ 1. Overt behavior

__ 2. Check for understanding

__ C. Activity

__ 1. Overt behavior (written or oral)

__ 2. Guided practice

__ 3. Independent practice

__ D. Response

__ 1. Clarify right or wrong answer

__ 2. Repeat the learning

__ E. Other/Comments _____

_____

FIGURE 1 (cont.)

__ II. Correct Level of Difficulty

__ A. Use of a task analysis is evident

__ 1. Review

__ 2. Questioning

__ 3. Sequencing

__ 4. Statement of objective

__ B. Use of Bloom's Taxonomy

__ 1. Statement of objective

__ 2. Questions

__ 3. Activity

__ 4. Testing

__ C. Other/Comments _____

_____

_____

__ III. Monitoring and Adjustment

__ A. Generate overt behavior

__ 1. Questions

__ 2. Activity

__ 3. Response

__ B. Interpret overt behavior

__ 1. Questions

__ 2. Response

__ C. Adjusts, if necessary

__D. Other/Comments _____

_____

_____

FIGURE 1 (cont.)

__ IV. Maintain Focus of the Learner

__ A. Set

__ 1. Statement of Learning

__ 2. Involvement

__ 3. Meaning

__ B. Explanation

__ 1. Critical element for relevancy

__ 2. Use of variables of motivation

__ C. Questions

__ 1. Overt behavior

__ 2. Generate thinking

__ D. Closure

__ 1. Involvement

__ 2. Summary

__ E. Other/Comments _____

_____

_____

FIGURE 1 (cont.)

__ V. Use Without Above Principles of Learning

__ A. Motivation

__ 1. Interest

__ 2. Feeling tone

__ 3. Success

__ 4. Tension/Concern

__ 5. Specific knowledge of results

__ 6. Reward

__ B. Reinforcement

__ 1. Positive

__ 2. Negative

__ 3. Extinction

__ 4. Schedules

__ a. Regular

__ b. Intermittent

__ C. Retention

__ 1. Degree of original learning

__ 2. Feeling tone

__ 3. Meaning

__ 4. Practice

__ a. Massed

__ b. Distributed

__ 5. Transfer

FIGURE 1 (cont.)

___ D. Transfer

___ 1. Similarity

___ 2. Association

___ 3. Degree of original learning

___ 4. Critical element

___ E. Other/Comments _____

_____

_____

Figure 2

SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING
Evaluation

To assist in an ongoing evaluation of the SET program, please answer the following questions:

	Which rating describes your present understanding of the following:			Which rating describes your ability to do the following:		
	To a Great Extent	Somewhat	To a Limited Extent	To a Great Extent	Somewhat	To a Limited Extent
1. Selecting the right objective at the correct level of difficulty	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Using the process of task analysis in planning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy to ascertain the complexity of thinking needed to master the objective	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Matching questions, objectives, and tests with objectives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Teaching to an objective using the four components	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Maintaining the focus of the learners on the objective from set to closure	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Monitoring student progress and making adjustments to your teaching teaching when necessary	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Using the principle of motivation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Using the principle of reinforcement	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Using the principle of retention	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Using the principle of transfer	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

FIGURE 2 (cont.)

Please comment on these aspects of the SET program:

1. What benefits did you as a teacher derive from SET?

2. What benefits do you believe students derived when SET is used in the classroom?

3. What do you see as the overall value of the SET program?

4. In what way(s) were the instructor and observers helpful/effective/persuasive, etc?

5. Please make any additional comments:

Date _____

School _____

Signature _____

FIGURE 3

ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS TOWARD THE

"SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING" (SET) PROGRAM

1. How many sessions of the SET inservice did you attend? (please circle one).

   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. In which of the following instructional skills, as taught by the SET program, do you believe that you demonstrated competency before participation in the SET inservice? (please check all that apply).

   ___ explanation (when teaching to the objective)

   ___ questions (when teaching to the objective)

   ___ activity

   ___ response

   ___ use of task analysis

   ___ use of Bloom's taxonomy

   ___ generate overt behavior

   ___ interpret overt behavior

   ___ adjusting, if necessary

   ___ set

   ___ explanation (maintain focus of the learner)

   ___ questions (maintain focus of the learner)

   ___ closure

   ___ motivation

   ___ reinforcement

   ___ retention

   ___ transfer

FIGURE 3 (cont.)

3. In which of the following instructional skills, as taught by the SET program, do you believe that you now demonstrate competncy after participation in the SET inservice? (please check all that apply).

___ explanation (teaching to the objective)

___ questions (teaching to the objective)

___ activity

___ response

___ use of task analysis

___ use of Bloom's taxonomy

___ generate overt behavior

___ interpret overt behavior

___ adjusting, if necessary

___ set

___ explanation (maintain focus of the learner)

___ questions (maintain focus of the learner)

___ closure

___ motivation

___ reinforcement

___ retention

___ transfer

FIGURE 3 (cont.)

4. In which of the abovementioned SET instructional skills would you like to receive further training (e.g., workshops, observation and conferences)? (please check all that apply).

___ explanation (teaching to the objective)

___ questions (teaching to the objective)

___ activity

___ response

___ use of task analysis

___ use of Bloom's taxonomy

___ generate overt behavior

___ interpret overt behavior

___ adjusting, if necessary

___ set

___ explanation (maintain focus of the learner)

___ questions (maintain focus of the learner)

___ closure

___ motivation

___ reinforcement

___ retention

___ transfer

5. How did your participation in the SET inservice affect your job attitude? (please circle one).

positively negatively no change

Please explain.

FIGURE 3 (cont.)

6. Do you believe that the SET program works for you as a teacher? (please circle one).

yes no

Please explain

7. Due to the increasing demand by the public for accountability through staff performance, the implementation of staff development programs, such as SET, has become necessary for all public school systems in Virginia. Would you recommend the SET program for other Virginia public schools? (please circle one)

yes no

Please explain.

References

Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Cruickshank, D.R., Lorish, C., and Thompson, L. What We Think We Know About Inservice Education, Journal of Teacher Education, 30 (Jan.-Feb.), 1979), p. 27.

Edelfelt, R.A., and Lawrence, G., In-Service Education: The State of the Art, Rethinking In-Service Education, eds. Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975, p.5

Griffin, G.A. The Work of Staff Development. Staff Development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, NSSE, 1983.

Howey, K.K., and Vaughan, J. Current Patterns of Staff Development. In Staff Development, op.cit., 1983.

Hunter, M. The Science of the Art of Teaching. Controversy in Education (eds.) D. Allen and J.C. Hecht, Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1973.

Ingersoll, G.M. Assessing In-Service Training Needs Through Teacher Responses, Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 2, 1975, p. 6-7.

Medley, D.M. The effectiveness of Teachers. Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications. (eds.) P.L. Peterson and H.G. Walberg. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishers, 1974.

Turner, J.S. A Study of Teachers' Perceptions of an Inservice Program in Three Sousthern Maryland Counties. Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1970.

Wood, F.H., Thompson, S.R., and Sister Francis Russell. Designing Effective Staff Development Programs, Staff Development/Organization Development [Yearbook] Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981, p. 33